

power without violating safeguards. Then it could withdraw from the NPT, and develop and assemble nuclear weapons in a short time.

That's the challenge we need to address. How do we counter not just states that do things in a ham-handed manner, but states that skillfully exploit the loopholes of the NPT? The Additional Protocol can help make it much harder to hide a covert nuclear program, if we persuade the rest of the world to sign such protocols as well. But how can we combat the "break-out" scenario?

One idea gaining currency is to allow non-nuclear weapons states to continue to possess civilian nuclear programs, but not a closed nuclear fuel cycle. A state could have civilian nuclear reactors to produce electrical power, but must import the nuclear reactor fuel and return any spent fuel. This would ensure that a state did not obtain fissile material needed for a nuclear weapon.

IAEA Director General Mohammed El-Baradei would allow only multinational facilities to produce and process nuclear fuels, and give legitimate end-users assured access to these fuels at reasonable rates. Gen. Brent Scowcroft and Dr. William Perry recently endorsed this proposal, adding that states that refuse this bargain should be subject to sanctions. President Bush has not endorsed multinational facilities, but called upon members of the Nuclear Suppliers Group to refuse to export enrichment and reprocessing equipment to any state that does not already possess full scale enrichment and reprocessing plants.

Any agreement on revising the nuclear non-proliferation regime will be difficult to achieve. Non-nuclear weapons states will ask what they will get for surrendering a well established right. States with nuclear fuel industries may worry that they will go out of business if only a few multinational facilities are allowed to operate enrichment and reprocessing activities. But the United States and other concerned states should set a goal of reaching a consensus in time for next year's NPT Review Conference. We have a window of opportunity, and we should use it.

There is another bargain central to the NPT, one that this administration largely prefers to ignore. In return for forswearing nuclear weapons, non-nuclear weapons states received a commitment from the five permanent nuclear powers, reaffirmed as recently as 2000, to seek eventual nuclear disarmament.

Nobody, including me, expects the United States to give up its nuclear deterrent any time in the foreseeable future. But the administration's drive to research and possibly produce new nuclear weapons—including low-yield nukes—is a step in the wrong direction. It signals to the rest of the world that even the preeminent global power needs new nuclear weapons to assure its own security.

The administration threatens to take another backward step on a Fissile Material Cutoff Treaty. An FMCT has been a U.S. objective for eight years, and this administration castigated other countries for preventing negotiations from starting. Now that there is a chance of success, however, the administration says that we may refuse to negotiate. This only undermines solidarity with our allies, which have worked for years to help us convince other countries to negotiate.

For all the flaws of the NPT, it is an essential treaty. It has been vital to encouraging states like Ukraine, Belarus, Kazakhstan, South Africa, Brazil and Argentina to end their nuclear weapons programs. The United States must work to improve the nuclear non-proliferation regime, and it must also do all that it can to abide by the bargains between the nuclear "haves" and the nuclear "have nots" that underlie world willingness to eschew the most awesome and awful weapons mankind has ever invented.

In conclusion, I want to congratulate and thank my chairman, Senator DICK LUGAR, for his fine leadership in bringing this resolution of ratification to fruition. It was not an easy task, and he demonstrated exceptional leadership. I am grateful also to our staffs, especially Ken Myers, III and Thomas Moore on the majority side, and Edward Levine and Jofi Joseph on the Democratic side. Finally, I want to commend the interagency committee that worked with us, and especially Ms. Susan Koch of the National Security Council staff. She is a real professional, and we would not have gotten to this day without her.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask for a division vote on the resolution of ratification.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. A division vote is requested. Senators in favor of the resolution of ratification will rise and stand until counted.

Those opposed will rise and stand until counted.

On a division vote, two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will now return to legislative session.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, APRIL 1, 2004

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, April 1. I further ask that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate

then begin a period for the transaction of morning business for up to 60 minutes, with the first 30 minutes under the control of the Democratic leader or his designee and the final 30 minutes under the control of the majority leader or his designee. I further ask unanimous consent that following the 60 minutes of morning business, the Senate resume consideration of H. R. 4, the welfare reauthorization bill; provided that there be 60 minutes of debate equally divided between the chairman and the ranking member of the Finance Committee for debate only; provided further, that the Senate then proceed to the cloture vote on the substitute amendment to the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, tomorrow, following morning business, we will resume consideration of the welfare bill. Shortly after 11:30 in the morning, the Senate will proceed to the cloture vote on the substitute amendment. It is unfortunate we have had to proceed with the cloture vote on this very important piece of legislation, but given the desire to offer unrelated amendments, the procedural vote is necessary. If cloture is invoked, we will be able to continue to consider welfare amendments, and we will finish the bill this week. It will be very unfortunate if cloture fails and we are unable to complete this bill this week because of unrelated issues. Additional votes are possible tomorrow, and Senators will be notified when votes are scheduled.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order following the remarks of Senator GRASSLEY.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Iowa.

NATIONAL ENERGY POLICY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, there has been a lot of discussion about high gasoline prices lately, and rightly so because gasoline prices are as high as they have ever been in the history of our country and, in the process, not only taking a lot of money out of the pockets of working men and women, but harming the overall economy. And the full impact has not been felt yet.

In the process of hearing so many remarks and concerns about this situation, as we heard for a half hour a few minutes ago from one of our colleagues from the other side of the aisle, I wonder if we are not hearing so many speeches from the other side of the